REMARKS

Claims 68, 70, 72, 74, 77, and 80 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 68-82 remain pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 70-71 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, claims 68-82 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, claims 68, 70, 72, 74, 76, 77, 79, 80, and 82 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) based on Farber, and claims 69, 71, 73, 75, 78, and 81 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Farber.

Claim 70 has been further amended to remove the "and/or" formulation on which the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph were based. Claim 71 was rejected as depending from claim 70. As such, the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph is believed to have been overcome.

With respect to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, claims 68 and 70 have been amended to provide an antecedent basis for the recited "apparatus". In addition, the claims have been amended to recite "wherein for each set the respective content provider may provide scheduling instructions tailored to the set of content data to control at least one of the duration, sequencing, and timing of the display of said image or images generated from the set of content data". As such, the "and/or" formulation has been removed with respect to the "duration, sequencing, and timing" portion of the claims and the claims have been amended to clarify that the final portion of the claim relates to the display of the "image or images" referred to earlier in the claims. To the extent the § 112, second paragraph rejections are based on the statement in the Office Action that the terms "duration", "sequencing", and "timing" all mean the same thing, the rejection is respectfully traversed. The application clearly defines "duration" to mean how

long a particular content set is displayed before a change is made to a different set of content data (if available). 34:2-12. An example of an instruction regarding duration would be "when displayed, show this content for five minutes, and then switch away from it". The application clearly defines "sequencing" as the order in which a particular image is displayed in relation to some other image, such as "show A first, then show B, then show C last". Application at 34:12-17. Finally, "timing" is defined as specifying one or more particular times, e.g., times of the day, when a particular set of content data may be displayed. Application at 34:17-27. Thus, "duration" refers to how long content is displayed before shifting away from it, "sequencing" refers to the order of display of content within a set, and "timing" refers to defining whether content is valid or available for display during a particular period. As such, the claims are believed to be sufficiently definite.

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and §103(a) are respectfully traversed. With respect to claim 68, the claim as amended recites "wherein each associated content provider provides its content data directly to the display device or to the content display system." The claim as amended clarifies that each of the plurality of content providers provides content directly to the user system. Farber, by contrast, teaches a centralized "service node" configured to gather content from disparate sources into one place and then feed content as requested from the single service node to one or more users. Farber Fig. 2 & 4:15-29. In fact, Farber teaches away from a model in which the content providers provide content directly to users. Farber 4:15-19. By contrast, claim 68 recites, "each associated content provider provides its content data directly to the display device or to the content display system." Support for the recited language appears, without limitation, in Application Figures 2 and 3A-3B, and Application at 27:24-29:11, 29:30-30:6, and 32:20-25.

Moreover, Farber does not teach a system "wherein for each set the respective content provider may provide scheduling instructions tailored to the set of content data to control at least one of the duration, sequencing, and timing of the display of said image or images generated from the set of content data," as recited in claim 68. The Office Action cites Farber at 4:8-11 as satisfying the pre-amendment version of this limitation. But in that section Farber merely notes that the system may be configured to allow the information providers 150, 152, and 154 of Figure 1 to initiate the sending of updated information to the service node 120 for subsequent transmission to one or more requesting users, as opposed to waiting for a query from the service node 120. Farber does not teach that the information providers control the duration, sequencing, or timing of the display of the information on the user display systems, as required by claim 68, merely that in one embodiment they may control the timing of the sending of updated information to the service node. In particular, Farber does not teach that each content provider may "provide scheduling instructions" as recited in claim 68, as no such scheduling structures are described in Farber. See, e.g., Farber at 4:8-11. Farber teaches that the duration, sequencing, and timing of the display of "image or images generated from the set of content data" are controlled by the user system, and in particular a screen saver program installed on the user's system in conjunction with user preferences stored in a database. Farber 5:10-64. As such, claim 68 is believed to be allowable over Farber.

Claim 69 depends from claim 68 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claim 70 has been amended similarly to claim 68 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claim 71 depends from claim 70 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claim 72 has been amended similarly to claim 68 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claim 73 depends from claim 72 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claim 74 has been amended similarly to claim 68 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claims 75-76 depend from claim 74 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claim 77 has been amended similarly to claim 68 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claims 78-79 depend from claim 77 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claim 80 has been amended similarly to claim 68 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claims 81-82 depend from claim 80 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification and claims by the current amendment with additions underlined and deletions struck through. The attached page is captioned "Version with markings to show changes made."

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

William J. James

William J. James
Registration No. 40,661
V 408-973-2592
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT AND YI, LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014